By Clarence A. Hall (*University of California, Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.*)

I recently received a copy of a comment by Bradley and Palmer [printed above] on my petition to add *Ceratostoma* Herrmannsen, 1846, to the Official List of Generic Names.

Because Martyn's name *Purpura* (*Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **15** : 393) has no status—making obsolete request (3) (a) of my petition—I suggest that the question of *Purpura* be considered separately from *Ceratostoma*.

Since Herrmannsen used the name *Ceratostoma* 41 years before Fischer (1887) and obviously did so purposely, I cannot agree with Bradley and Palmer—but this is the crux of the problem that must be decided on by the Commission. I would request that only arguments germane to *Ceratostoma* are considered, so as not to cloud the issue.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE A NEOTYPE FOR *RANA FASCIATA* BURCHELL, 1824

Z.N.(S.) 1253

By Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(see volume 19, pages 290–292)

Obviously the long-established association of the nominal species *fasciata* with the biological species that has universally been known by the name *Rana fasciata*, at least since 1849, must be maintained. A transfer of name from one species to another is unthinkable in modern nomenclatural practice, at least among species as commonly known and cited as these.

However, as a general policy, to which in my opinion the present case is no exception, it is surely unwise to designate a neotype which does not represent the species to which the name was originally applied. If at all possible, surely the stringent requirements of the 1961 Code relative to neotypes should be held inviolate, particularly the requirement of the maximum reasonable correspondence of neotype and the original type (or whatever the original onomatophore might be).

This general policy may be maintained in the present case by the simple device of validating the name *fasciata* as of Smith, 1849 (with exactly the same lectotype as requested by Drs. Parker and Ride), and at the same time invalidating, by a blanket decree, all earlier usages of the name *Rana fasciata*. In this way the neotype of *Rana fasciata* Smith, 1849, will actually represent the species of the description the Commission designates as " original ", rather than a species different from the neotype as would be true if the neotype is designated for Burchell, 1824. Since the latter author has in the past been rarely cited as the original source of the name, and since by either Parker and Ride's recommendation or the present one a change in author name is required, the names of Burchell and Smith are of equal merit in this particular point.

In every other particular, approval by the Commission of the proposals pertaining to this case is strongly recommended.

In summary, it is here requested that the Commission approve the proposal in its entirety except that : (1) the neotype of *Rana fasciata* be fixed with Smith, 1849, rather than with Burchell, 1824, to preserve as closely as possible common identity of type and original description ; (2) Smith's usage of 1849 be designated as the original usage of *Rana fasciata* ; and (3) all earlier usages of *Rana fasciata* be declared invalid and unavailable from the stand-point of the Laws both of homonymy and priority.

J. C. Poynton (*University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa*)

I am at the last stages of completing a taxonomic revision of the Amphibia of southern Africa, and I want to endorse most strongly the proposals of Parker and Ride. It seems highly probable that *R. fasciata* Burchell is the form that has been called *R. grayi* for over a century, and a change of names would cause much greater confusion than uniformity. Furthermore, Burchell's description is inadequate, and it cannot be demonstrated unequivocally that *R. fasciata* Burchell is *R. grayi* of later authors. Consequently, in the existing state of affairs, complete stability can never be achieved.

Therefore I believe that there is every reason and justification for the International Commission to use its plenary powers in this case. The suggestions of Parker and Ride as to how the Commission should use its powers appear to be the best that can be made. I have examined the proposed neotype of *R. fasciata*, and I agree with the authors that it was probably the specimen used in the preparation of Smith's figure of *fasciata* (*Illustr. Zool. S. Afr.* pl. 78). As this figure has been the point of reference of all subsequent authors, it can be considered to have already stabilized the name in practice. All that is needed to finalize the stability of this name—and that of *R. grayi*—is to place the names on the Official List, as proposed by Parker and Ride.

As the publication of my revision of the Amphibia of southern Africa is being held up over this matter, it would be much appreciated if it could be dealt with as speedily as possible.